

Respected elders and my fellow brothers and sisters in humanity, - I greet you all with the universal Islamic greeting of peace- As salaamu alaikum! Firstly, I wish thank the organisers for this opportunity to address this honourable gathering and hope that it will be mutually beneficial. There is much to be said, but I shall keep it short as I can, without detracting from the essence of the message I wish to convey.

The Qur'ân in 2:42: states: "AND MIX NOT UP TRUTH WITH FALSEHOOD, NOR HIDE THE TRUTH WHILE YOU KNOW."

The Qur'an states: 14:4: "We (i.e. Allâh) sent not a messenger except (to teach) in the language of his (own) people, in order to make (things) clear to them and understandable....."

To begin the discussion the following is of utmost importance:

- 1 Truthfulness is a quality that everyone loves and deceit is detested. It is important not to believe blindly and take for granted, but to weigh and consider carefully before accepting or rejecting anything. Most people follow blindly what others have informed them, because they do not examine the evidence to establish if the sources they use are actually the truth. We also know truth is something that can be very hurtful but truth has to be said if it is based on factual evidence. Please, I want to ask pardon in advance if I hurt anyone's feelings when the facts are presented. **To me as a Muslim it is even more hurtful when I hear the forged history of one that Muslims love and revere, Nabi Isâ whom Christians call Jesus.** I can answer any questions on this talk afterwards, but I want to caution that that will be even more hurtful when further facts are presented.
- 2 The Qur'an stresses in many verses including 2:111; 37:156: **Produce your Proof for what you claim, and it must be such that it can be examined and verified.**
- 3 Nabi Isâ or Jesus as Christians' call him was born in Palestine and Palestine was under the occupation of the pagan Romans (who spoke Latin) when he began to preach his message to his own people of whom himself was i.e. of the Bani **Isrâ'îl**, meaning that this name was derived from Yacub whom Allâh named **Isrâ'îl** (this is stated in the Qur'an, and his offspring became known as Bani **Isrâ'îl**). However keep in mind that the people in Palestine, since time immemorial be they Muslims or Christians speak Arabic even today.
- 4 I am not here to convert anyone but to make one to reason and ponder and be truthful to one's own self if one is really on the path of truth or not after the facts are presented.

INTRODUCTION: The Facts about the Bible: Please note that I shall repeat some of the information as it is important to stress certain points:

What should be made known is the fact that the history of the Bible as revealed by authentic sources of Christians and Jews proves that **the Greeks first constructed the Septuagint** with the help of some Jews so it is claimed, although it is lost.

Their statements reveal that the Bible is not a divine book according to the following submissions: The first Church in Christianity claim in their official documents written under the auspicious of the Pope Paul VI (1965) and Pope John XXXIII (1959):

“Bible, Manuscripts of the. Copies of the Biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and printed copies of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages. None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals.” (Catholic Bible p. 30) (Authorised by Pope Paul VI (1965) and Pope John XXXIII (1959))

Page | 2

First point: Since when can a piece of work based on a copy of some book, or manuscripts which is claimed to be a copy of the lost original translated from a different language, project valid support in favour of the meaning of the original? On what basis can a copy without the original authentic (crucial) document be valid in verifying this claim? **Please pay special attention to the words: “...None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist....”**

Second point: The first Church in Christianity is the Roman Catholic Church, (which is not disputed by anyone) and they claim that the Old Testament generally consists of 45 books and the New Testament consists of 27 books. Then amazingly, they add a qualification to it: *“Although the number might be some-what higher or lower depending on how one separates or combines certain Old Testament books”*.¹

However, the Protestants who came into existence 1,228 years after the first Church, (i.e. in the 16th century) claim that the Old Testament contains only 39 books. (Refer-New Bible Dictionary Second impression, 1988, p. 138)

The evidence to substantiate what has been said:

It came about that in 1553 Martin Luther ², who led the reformation, discovered that the Catholics made a submission which gave licence to all and sundry to create their own Bibles; and simultaneously the strangle hold of the Roman Catholic Church was broken. That submission is as stated: i.e.: The first Church in Christianity – the Catholic Church claims under the auspicious of the Pope Paul VI (1965) and Pope John XXXIII (1959) states in their official documentation:

“Bible,None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist,.....”

1 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 28 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: C.B. (Original Catholic Bibles and Bible Dictionaries-Authorised by Pope Paul VI (1965) and Pope John XXXIII (1959))

² *Reformation’ according to the S.A. Oxford Dictionary -2006- states: “A Religious Movement in Europe in the 16th Century intended to reform certain teachings and practices of the Roman Church, resulting in the establishment of the Reformed and Protestant Churches”.*

The effect of the above claim is so devastating that the other denominations of Christianity which came into existence 1,228 years (16th century like Martin Luther, Calvin and others) after the first Church want to claim that the first Church has no right to state what they claimed is the truth! On what grounds can anyone object to what the original Church in Christianity know are the facts? After all they were the creators of the Bible, and all the new Christian Sects that came into existence 16 centuries later accepted the first church's Bible and modified it to suit them. In spite of their irrational objections, the combined mainstream Protestant Churches claims:

"Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived, textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which textual critics of the Bible work includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors". (New Bible Dictionary First Edition, 1978, p. 151. And in the second edition 1988, it appears on page 140)

The above submission must have been known to them as they were originally all Catholics, who became Protestants only after they first became *apostates*! However, it is clear that the main bone of contention must have been the Bible itself! The fact that the Biblical contents were changed proves the point!

The question is: Why was it so easy to create all the thousands of denominations in Christianity if the Bible was the word of the God? There are many reasons that made it so simple! Out of many, **one of the most obvious is the language!** The Catholics and the Protestants do not even know the language the divine revelations were revealed in, so each cannot contest what the other claims!

Is it not strange that "Moses"³ is claimed to have appeared in the year 4004 BC? Yet, the name of the book is claimed to be the *Bible* (Byblos) which is 'derived through Latin from the Greek' language! (New Bible Dictionary Second impression, 1988, p. 137)

Both nations, the Greeks and Romans entered Palestine thousands of years after "Moses"! Now surely "Moses" could never have spoken to Pharaoh in any of the languages claimed by the Jews and Christians, *which according to them* was Hebrew or even if they want to claim that it was Aramaic! It should be known that the name of the language **Hebrew** is a Greek word (See Peake's Commentary on the Bible. 1919, p. 34) and not a word originated from the Children of Isrâ'îl. What does this mean? It means that not one word of the Old Testament could have been spoken by Moses, as no prophet that came to the Children of Isrâ'îl spoke Hebrew! **Hebrew as a language was only completed in the tenth century of the Christian era. That is 1,000 years after Jesus!** So Jesus could never have spoken Hebrew and neither would God have revealed His message in an incomplete language.

Let me quote SIR THOMAS ARNOLD on the language question to allay any misunderstandings:

"Aramaic was a poverty-stricken tongue compared with Arabic, and not even classical Hebrew at its best could rival Arabic in its astonishing elasticity. From its own inner resources it could evolve by autogenous processes the *mot juste* (i.e. 'exactly the right word or words to express

3 : The name Moses is derived from the pagan.

something') which new arts and new sciences demanded for their intellectual expression."

'The Legacy of Islam Edited by the late SIR THOMAS ARNOLD C.I.E., F.B.A., Litt.D. and ALFRED GUILLAUME M.A. Oxon., Principal of Culham College Formerly Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Durham'

The New Bible Dictionary of the Protestants states:

Page | 4

"A further implication is that Moses would have an Egyptian education, one of the best available in his day." *The Protestant New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 305.*

Be that as it may, Pharaoh would never have spoken with him in the language of the slaves! Even if we want to agree that prophet Mûsâ (pbuh) spoke Hebrew, then we must also agree that the communication with Pharaoh must have been in the Egyptian language.

Therefore, there is no ORIGINAL Old Testament in the world! One must keep in mind that prophet Mûsâ's brother Harûn (p.b.u.them) or Moses and Aaron as Christians call them, must also have spoken the Egyptian language.

The Children of Israel were the slaves of the Pharaohs for more than 400 years⁴. Consequently, it could therefore have been possible that they could no longer have spoken their own mother tongue, which could have been the reason that they had to speak some language of the Egyptians.

May I remind that *Hebrew is a Greek word* (See Peake's Commentary on the Bible. 1919, p. 34) *and not a word belonging to a language of the Children of Israel*, therefore it should be understood that because everyone is referring to it as Hebrew, we will retain the word as Hebrew; but this in no way means that we agree that Hebrew is the correct word or language. This leaves us with the question, as to whether prophet Mûsâ (p.b.u.h) could have been the author of a part of the Hebrew Old Testament. These points are sufficient to reject that there is an ORIGINAL Old Testament!

THE NEW TESTAMENT

According to the Catholic Bible (1959), the language Jesus spoke is ARAMAIC which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time.⁵

"...No contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic] remains, we cannot determine precisely the dialect He spoke." (Catholic Bible., p. 30)

This means that there cannot be any ORIGINAL words in any book which Jesus spoke, because there are no words in the original language that Jesus spoke. The main point to understand is: There are no ORIGINALS

4 : An example is in South Africa, when the 'new nation' – Coloureds' -born of the raping of the Koisian women by the Dutch pagans learnt to speak the language of the Dutch rapists i.e. Afrikaans. The same happened in some South American countries where Spanish is now the spoken language due to the pagan Spaniards conquering there. The same happened in many African countries by the French and Italians pagans. Not one African American born in the USA can speak his mother tongue!

5 : J. P. O'Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30.

of any of the books *i.e.* Old or New Testaments!!! We have given sufficient crystal clear evidence already of this from authentic Christian documents of the mainstream churches.

Let us examine it from another perspective:

Apostates according to the first Church, the Roman Catholic Church

Page | 5

When some of the followers of the Roman Catholic Church decided to break away from the Church, and became **Protestants** they must either have disagreed with the Bible not being the words of God or they disagreed with the Pope or the Bishops or the Priests. **If they disagreed with the Pope or the Bishops or the Priests, then they would not have changed the Bible.**

However, they have changed the Bible which makes it clear that it was the first Bible which they could not tolerate. If they had only disagreed with the Pope or the Bishops or the Priests or only one of the groups then they would never have changed the first Bible. Make no mistake, that those who broke away from the original Church must be termed as apostates. That is the *first* iniquity⁶ they committed; the *second* is a sin they committed is that they removed some books from the first Bible; the *third* sin they committed was that they changed the *modus operandi* of the Church.

Removal of verses from the Bible:

The Bible with fewer verses appeared first in the Jehovah's Witnesses' Bible. Thereafter, the New International Version's Textual Critics decided to do the same as that of the Jehovah's Witnesses' Bible, but the New International Version's Textual Critics decided to remove the number of the verse also:

Refer to the following: Matthew 17: 21; Matthew 18: 11; Matthew 23:14; Mark 7: 16; Mark 11: 26; Luke 23: 17; John 5:4; Acts 8: 37; Acts 15: 34; Acts 24: 7; Acts 28:29; Romans 16: 24;

Please keep in mind that we are not claiming that the Roman Catholics have the truth, as we have made our stand clear that they also do not possess the truth as by their own admission above; what we are doing is only revealing the state of those who broke away from the original Church. We shall reveal the state of all those who follows the Bible! One needs not to be a D.D. to come to the conclusion that *the Bible of all denominations is the main bone of contention*. It is important that we start with the biblical history as reported by those who broke away from the Roman Catholic Church.

HISTORY OF THE VULGATE - ST. JEROME'S⁷ VULGATE. -

⁶ The reason for not qualifying it a true sin is because in actual fact they did not violate the words of God, as it is absent from them.

⁷ "It reached even the ears of Constantine. Now sole emperor, he saw in the one Catholic Church the best means of counteracting the movement in his vast empire towards disintegration; and he at once realised how dangerous dogmatic strife might prove to its unity". (Encyclopaedia Britannica, (1929) Vol. 6, Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 358)

"Constantine had no religious understanding concerning the question at issue" but had more political knowledge and knew how to resolve it in the best interest of his pagan Empire. Therefore, no course was left but to summon a general or ecumenical council, which was convened in Nicaea in 325. "After various turns in the controversy, it was finally decided, against Arius, that the Son was of the same substance ... with the Father, and all thought of his being created or even subordinated had to be excluded. Constantine accepted the decision of the council and resolved to uphold it." *It says further:* ".... Under the auspices of Throdosius The Great, recognised the Nicene doctrine as the only orthodox one" (Encyclopaedia Britannica, (1929) Vol. 6, Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 359)

Jerome made contact with those baptised by the Arians, and Jerome joined the fray. He was guided by the practice of Rome and the West. Having discovered what the Western practice was, he set tongue and pen to work with his usual bitterness. It was after 382 AD

In the year 384 C.E. Damasus died, "and was succeeded by Siricius, who did not show much friendship towards Jerome. He found it expedient to leave Rome, and set out for the East in 385." The journey took Jerome to Antioch: (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 13, op. cit., p. 2)

"There he was joined by two wealthy Roman ladies, Paula, a widow, and Eustochium, her daughter, one of Jerome's Hebrew students. They came accompanied by a band of Roman maidens who vowed to live a celibate life in a nunnery in Palestine. Accompanied by these ladies Jerome made the tour of Palestine...." Page | 6

Paula built four monasteries, of which three were for nuns and the fourth for monks.

"Jerome resided over the fourth monastery. Here he did most of his literary work, and throwing aside his unfinished plan for a translation from Origen's Hexaplar⁸ text, translated the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew, with the aid of Jewish scholars. He mentions a rabbi from Lydda, a rabbi from Tiberias, and above all Rabbi Ben Anina, who came to him by night secretly for fear of the Jews. Jerome makes the synagogue responsible for the accuracy of his version: "Let him who would challenge aught in this translation," he states, "ask the Jews."

(No names of the other 'Jews' mentioned, and why secretly?)

"The result of all this labour was the Latin translation of the Scriptures, which afterwards became the Vulgate or authorised version; but the Vulgate as we have it now suffered a good deal from changes made under the influence of the older translations; the text became very corrupt during the middle ages, and in particular all the apocrypha books (*meaning doubtful books*), except Tobit and Judith, which Jerome translated from the Chaldee, were added from the older versions." : Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 2-3.

PROTESTANT VIEW POINT OF THE VULGATE

"He was commissioned by the then Pope to produce a Latin rendering of the whole of the Bible, and he began by revising for the NT and the Psalter the existing translations into Latin, the so-called Old Latin texts, to bring them into line with the LXX [Septuagint]." [Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 58c, p. 75]

Note: Jerome was assigned to revise the Bible: The proper meaning of the word revise according to The New Collins Concise Dictionary 1985, is "*to change or amend*", "*or to prepare a new story*". According to the above statement, St. Jerome did the most unforgivable sin when he began to change or amend, or prepare a new story of the 4 Gospels.

that Jerome was given the work 'to revise the "Old Latin" translation of the Bible; and to this task he henceforth devoted his great abilities.' (Encyclopaedia Britannica, (1929) Vol. 13, op. cit., p. 2)

⁸ (1) Hexapla (Ἑξαπλά: Gr. for "sixfold") is the term for an edition of the Bible in six versions. Especially it applies to the edition of the Old Testament compiled ... (2) Catholic Encyclopaedia- Quite recently (1896 and 1900) fragments of the Hexaplar Psalms were fortunately discovered, which give us our only specimens of connected portions of Origen's work and ... (3) The Syro-hexaplar version (also Syro-hexapla) is the Syriac translation of the Septuagint, as revised by Origen of Alexandria in his Hexapla.

Hence, the Vulgate of Jerome became his original work, which means that no other Vulgate existed before his time. It could also mean that the original Vulgate of Jerome could have existed between 340 and 420 C.E and therefore had to be translated from a non-vowel text if there was one, as the vowel system only emerged in the 7th century C.E or during "C.E 500 to 1000". However, the point in question is that the Vulgate of Jerome had to be *"in line with the LXX"*. If this is so, then the Vulgate of Jerome is also an unreliable source as the Septuagint is said to have been the work of 'ignorant' scribes. (Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 49c, page 63)

THE HOLY BIBLE OF 1896

The following information from the Holy Bible of 1896 is a devastating blow to the Protestants, it makes them one of the newest religions in the world; dating in reality only from the nineteenth century; in any case they are apostates according to the first church of Christianity and are plagiarises:-

The Holy Bible of 1896 opens with the following words:

"To the most high and mighty prince James, by the grace of God, King of great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c."

Thereafter it states:

"There are no very ancient MSS. [MSS = Manuscripts] of the Hebrew Bible, and of such as have come down to us, all belong to the same family or recension⁹. The earliest dated Hebrew manuscript known was written in 916 A.D. another, undated, which has recently been bought by the Trustees of the British Museum, is probably a little older. Many were destroyed in the Middle Ages, and others were buried through the pious, if mistaken, reverence of the Jews. That other recensions were at one time in existence is shown by the variations in the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, by means of which we are able in some cases to reconstruct the original which they represent" [The Holy Bible 1896 Oxford: Printed at the University Press'.

Note the words: *-no very ancient manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible; earliest dated 916 AD; variations in the ancient versions'*! Please also keep in mind that the Vulgate of Jerome is also an unreliable source as the Septuagint is said to have been the work of 'ignorant' scribes. (Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 49c, page 63)

We have the first oldest manuscripts dated 916 AD which is the Massoretic text. Then we have the Dead Sea Scrolls which brings the date a thousand years backwards. If the Dead Sea Scrolls is a thousand years older, then the Bible cannot be older than about 100 BC. **Even though the Dead Sea Scrolls are supposed to be the oldest, there is not one Bible that contains its contents.** *Amazing is it not?* They were forced to keep the

⁹ (1) Recension is the practice of editing or revising a text based on critical analysis. When referring to manuscripts, this may be a revision by another author. (2) *noun*: change; rewriting. Synonyms: alteration, amendment, correction, editing, emendation, modification, overhauling,...

documents for fifty years in secret and had to kill John Marco Allegro¹⁰ - in order to protect the secret of their manipulations of the Scrolls. So many controversial things were written about the Scrolls, but till today they have not been fully released, or even used in any of the Bibles.

(To digress: We strongly believe that the creation of Israel in 1948 was as a direct result of the Scrolls. It seems to have been the bargaining chip for Israel and its protection. Before 1947 the Jews and Christians did not see eye to eye but suddenly after the discovery of the Scrolls things changed dramatically and so quickly that Israel was created under the auspicious of the Christian nations.)

Page | 8

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES claim: "The Bible was written over a span of some 1,600 years, from 1513 B.E.C. to about 98 C.E." (Awake! November 2007 Special issue Can You Trust The Bible?' page 7)

We can safely say that the age of the Bible cannot begin before 100 BC, or let us be generous and give it an extra 500 years grace; then we still have 3400 years left for which we must discover biblical documents in order to substantiate the authenticity of the Bible. All truthful scholars of the Bible know that there are no documents for those years. According to the book 'The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary' Jesus was born '(c 4 B.C. - c A.D. 30)'.

Just on the above information the Bible cannot be from God and by extension Christianity also cannot be the message of Jesus!

J. Arthur Findlay in the following words further supports the above view:

"Christianity was the compromise. Conditions then were like conditions now..... Constantine on reaching the throne saw how events were moving within his domain, especially in Rome, and decided that the then little known cult, Christianity, suited best the needs of the people, provided its differences could be settled and it was brought more into line with pagan thought. Eusebius and Athanasius produced the necessary structure, the former the Nicene Creed and the latter the ideas which ultimately developed into the Athanasian Creed. Eusebius and the other Church fathers, it is reasonable to believe, would not hesitate to make what alterations were necessary in the writings and records of the cult to bring them into line with the creeds they produced. Honesty and accuracy, as we understand them, did not exist in those days. For three hundred years prior to Nicæa no historical records existed, so there was no great difficulty in deluding the people as to the past story of the cult. Anything could be added to or from its past beliefs without undue comment" [The Unfolding Universe or The Evolution subtracted of Man's Conception of his Place in Nature, 1935, pp. 143-144]

This is supported by the New Apostolic Church (pp. 98-99); History of the Kingdom of God, 1971 Edition.

"In those days only a few wealthy people possessed a Bible, which existed in no other language but Latin, for the Bibles had to be copied by hand as the printing press had not yet been invented. Consequently a Bible cost an enormous sum of money. Moreover not many

10 : The new book 'The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English Translated by Geza Vermes' only mention his name on page 5, and on page 21, Vermes says 'This trend was continued with loud media support by J. M. Allegro's speculation about the role of *amanita muscaria*, a hallucinogenic fungus, in the genesis of the Christian Church.' but kept quiet about him being murdered. This fact tells a huge story!

were able to read at that time. Therefore the only way the common people could hear about the Gospel teaching was through itinerant preachers."

1896 BIBLE

This 1896 Bible reveals that Genesis chapter one began in the year 4004 BC; and the following is important information, because it tells us that Genesis derived its name from the Septuagint. According to Peake's Commentary, referring to the Septuagint, he said that the 'translators were just as ignorant of the meaning as were the Massoretes who vocalised the Bible in the 8th-9th century A.D' (See Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 49c, page 63 -). A very significant disclosure concerning the destruction of the Pentateuch is given in the New Bible Dictionary. This will clear all the uncertainty contained in the present non-divine reconstructed Pentateuch. The statement is made in the following words:

Page | 9

"The tradition expressed in 2 Esdras 14:21-22, that the scrolls of the Pentateuch, burned in Nebuchadrezzar's siege of Jerusalem, were rewritten by Ezra, was apparently accepted by a number of the early church fathers, e.g. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome. They did not, however, reject the Mosaic authorship of the original law. The first recorded instance of such a rejection is the statement of John of Damascus concerning the Nasaraeans, a sect of Jewish Christians (PG 94. 688-689) [PG = J. P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca]. The Clementine Homilies teach that diabolical interpolations were made in the Pentateuch to try to put Adam, Noah and the Patriarchs in a bad light". (New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 904)

Now we examine the claim that the Bible was in the 'Original Greek language'.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Translated out of the Greek: being the version set forth A.D. 1611 Compared with the most ancient Authorities and revised A.D. 1881. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge - Cambridge at the University* Press 1881 Page xii.

"EVIDENCE OF THE COMPILATION OF THE BIBLE IN THE 1881 BIBLE":

"A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing reading in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various which might properly affect the translation. When these were adjusted, our deviations from the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version had next to be indicated, in accordance with the fourth rule; but it proved inconvenient to record them in the margin. A better mode however of giving them publicity has been found, as the University Presses have undertaken to print them in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. In regard of the readings thus approved, it may be observed that fourth rule, by requiring that 'the text to be adopted' should be 'that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating,' was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times,

and therefore to employ the resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek New Testament, forms a special study of much intricacy and difficulty, and even now leaves room for considerable variety of opinion among competent critics. Different schools of criticism have been represented among us, and have together contributed to the final result. In the early part of the work every various reading requiring consideration was discussed and VOTED on by the Company.¹¹ ('Preface' of 'The New Testament Of Our Lord And Saviour Jesus Christ Translated Out Of The Greek: Being The Version Set Forth A.D.1611 Compared With The Most Ancient Authorities And Revised A.D 1881' Page Xii.)

In simple English, 1881 AD is the actual date of real Protestant Christianity, which makes it one of the most recent or new religions to have come into being in the world. At least, one can say that they gave themselves the right to VOTE for the contents of this new religion!!! Note also: the "English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek,..." meaning that the so called original was now subjected to the English translation in some parts!

The English Revised Standard Version -1980, on page iii, states:

"The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, and the first to be printed was the work of William Tyndale. He met bitter opposition. He was willfully perverting the meaning of the Scriptures, and his New Testament were ordered to be burned as "untrue translations." He was finally betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and in October, 1536, he was publicly executed and burned at the stake. **Yet Tyndale's work became the foundation of subsequent English version**".

If Tyndale's work was burnt and rejected as "untrue", the question remains what was left. Assume the remains of his work were preserved then, it means the English version of the New Testament is based entirely on parts of his work. Our concern is that it would be extremely difficult to ascertain what an author articulated in his research if only a section of the research was used. Hence, if the English version of the New Testament is based entirely on a piece of incomplete work, how valid can such a version be? On the other hand, if none of his "untrue translations" could be retrieved, on what is the English version of the New Testament based?

6TH AND 7TH CENTURIES

The important point to know and fully understand is the fact the no Bible in any form existed during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) – as even the Dead Sea Scrolls were not known to anyone until 1947 AD! Moreover, any claim of a Hebrew Bible during the time of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) cannot be true as the Hebrew language was created by the Greeks – even the name of the language called *Hebrew* is a Greek word! (Peake's Commentary on the Bible. 1919, p. 34). Hebrew as a language was only completed in the 10th century by the Massorites; and as Sir

¹¹ : 'Preface' of 'The NEW TESTAMENT of OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST TRANSLATED OUT OF THE GREEK: BEING THE VERSION SET FORTH A.D.1611 COMPARED WITH THE MOST ANCIENT AUTHORITIES AND REVISED A.D 1881' Page xii.

Arnold declares about the Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic Languages: **“Aramaic was a poverty-stricken tongue compared with Arabic, and not even classical Hebrew at its best could rival Arabic in its astonishing elasticity. From its own inner resources it could evolve by autogenous processes the *mot juste* (i.e. ‘*exactly the right word or words to express something*’) which new arts and new sciences demanded for their intellectual expression.”**

Page | 11

According to the Virtues Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be Aramaic, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time.¹² If this is so then the Essenes (the genuine Children of Israel) could also have spoken Aramaic, as Jesus grew up amongst them in his boyhood years. (See Peake 1962, p. 734: 639h)

Please note the Jews of today are not the Children of Israel, but the offspring of the Greeks and Romans. See **Paul Johnson’s book- “History of the Jews”**; and also **“The History of the Jews” by Mofsowitz Potashnickh.**

(Note: One can email mofsowitz@gmail.com for a free copy of the book). Already, one can see that much confusion exists about the mother tongue language of Jesus, since **“...no contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic remains] we cannot determine precisely the dialect He (Jesus) spoke”** [our emphases and insertion.]. (C.B. p. 30) At this point, we want to emphasise again the fact that Jesus’ dialect of Aramaic is unknown, as admitted by the Catholic and Protestant Churches.

The Protestants further state:

“Thus the task of New Testament textual criticism is vast and unfinished.” [New Bible Dictionary First Edition, 1978, p. 1269]

The Catholics say: (Virtue’s Catholic Encyclopaedia. 1965. Volume one, page 141- written on the authority of Pope) - **“It is true that this Gospel was largely dependent upon an earlier Aramaic writing, which tradition assures us was composed by St. Matthew. But this work of St. Matthew no longer exists, and the Gospel which now bears the name of Matthew was written in Greek and based on the work of St. Mark.”**: (Original Catholic Bibles and Bible Dictionaries- Authorised by Pope Paul VI (1965) and Pope John XXXIII (1959)

The phrase **“None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals”** brings out the fact that the Bible was constructed from evil men’s own ideas!!! We need to remind ourselves that the Old Testament only dates from 916 A.D.!

It is not even necessary to expose the fact that the NIV Bible has fewer verses than the 1881 New Testament! After a meticulous contemplation of the Christian’s own submission, one comes to realise that the reason as to why the Bible contains extremely absurdness which the followers of the Bible term *miracles* is simply the result of man-made concoctions created by the pagans!!!

12 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: C.B. Original Catholic Bibles and Bible Dictionaries-Authorised by Pope Paul VI (1965) and Pope John XXXIII (1959)

New Apostolic Church

The Greeks influence on the Bible

It appears obvious that the Greeks also had a Bible, which was translated from the *Latin* version, as there was no other Bible available at the time. According to the New Apostolic Church: (pp. 98-99); *History of the Kingdom of God*, 1971 Edition that during *sixteenth century*

Page | 12

The New Apostolic Church further reveals that during *sixteenth century* of the Reformation there

"In those days only a few wealthy people possessed a Bible, which existed in no other language but Latin¹³,...." -

They further state:

"When printing was invented by John Gutenberg in Mainz in 1444, and when the Greek language became better known after some Greeks had fled from Constantinople when that town was conquered, the main obstacles were removed."¹⁴

The question is: what were the 'obstacles'? If the Latin version of the Bible was correct, then it could not have been one of the 'obstacles'. Were all the other interpretations of the Bible not correct? Or, were the new interpretations one of the 'obstacles' before the invention of printing? The answers to these questions must be that all the interpretations were derived from the Latin Bible, although it was translated into other languages. If it is not so, then what were the 'obstacles'? The only conclusion could be that one of the 'obstacles' was that the Gospels were said to have been recorded in Greek. Knowing that **Jesus never spoke Greek** and it was only later translated into **Latin**, in spite of the fact that there were no original **Greek** Bibles in existence. An attempt to remove one of the main obstacles is to say that the Gospels were written in Greek, so that no one is in a position to ask for the original Gospel of Jesus, which should have been recorded in Aramaic. Therefore, it is reported in such a manner that it may appear to project the idea that the Greeks produced their own Greek Bible from Constantinople. Nay, an attempt was made to remove the main obstacle, that is: the method that was applied was to produce a story as to how the Greek Bible came into existence.

That is why they produced a Greek Bible so that it could be claimed that the first Gospels were written in Greek. By this implication a fictitious argument comes about and tantamount to a claim that the Roman Catholics understood it all wrong.

The statement says: **"From that time it was possible to translate the Bible easily and also to provide the common people with copies of it - nothing could delay a reformation of the Church any longer."**¹⁵

I thank you my sincere appeal to you all is to do your own research into the History of the Bible, and make your own decisions. Let there not be regrets and recriminations on the Day of Judgment as is stated in the Qur'an:

¹³ .¹³"History of the Kingdom of God"; New Apostolic Church, [Hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: N.A.C.] Dortmund, Germany. Vol 1, 1st edition 1971. [1998 Edition]

¹⁴ : N.A.C., p. 104 (1st Edition. History of the Kingdom of God, vol 1. – Printed 1971)

¹⁵: p. 104. N.A.C. (New Apostolic Church- History of the Kingdom of God Vol 1- Issued by the Apostle's College of the New Apostolic Church, Dortmund, Germany)

41:29. "And the unbelievers will say: "Our Lord! Show us those, among Jinns and men, who misled us: we shall crush them beneath our feet, so that they become the vilest (before all)."

28:63. "Those against whom the charge will be proved, will say: "Our Lord! these are the ones whom we led astray: we led them astray, as we were astray ourselves:....."

INFORMATION IN THE BIBLE TO THAT OF THE ARABIC GLORIOUS QUR'AN RELATING TO PHARAOH'S BODY

Page | 13

Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th edition volume xvii, page 22, under the heading "Mummy"

The Bible claims that Pharaoh's body was not preserved as '*there remained not so much as one of them*' (King James Version. Exodus 14:28).

Al-Qur'an chapter 10 v 92 states:

"But this day We shall save thee (Pharaoh) in thy body that thou mayest be a sign to those after thee. And surely most of the people are heedless of Our signs." (Arabic Glorious Qur'an chapter 10: verse 92)

(Please note - it does not matter if a new discovery reveals that the Pharaoh of Moses was only now discovered, as some are now claiming- the fact is that Pharaoh's body is preserved and not as the KJV Bible contradicts in Exodus 14:28.)

The facts stated in verse Al-Qur'an chapter 10 v 92 was only verified 1,200 years (in the 1800's) after its revelation, as human beings cannot reveal the unknown! The unknown is only within the knowledge of the Creator.

I conclude with the following 2 verses:

فَوَيْلٌ لِلَّذِينَ يَكْتُبُونَ الْكِتَابَ بِأَيْدِيهِمْ ثُمَّ يَقُولُونَ هَذَا مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ لِيَشْتَرُوا بِهِ ثَمَنًا قَلِيلًا ۖ فَوَيْلٌ لَهُمْ مِمَّا كَتَبَتْ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَوَيْلٌ لَهُمْ مِمَّا يَكْسِبُونَ ﴿٨﴾

Al-Qur'an 2:79: "Then woe to those who write the Book with their own hands, and then say: "This is from Allāh," to traffic with it for miserable price! - woe to them for what their hands do write, and for the gain they make thereby."

HATRED OF THE TRUTH!

43/78: "Verily We (*i.e.* Allāh) have brought the truth to you: but most of you have a hatred for Truth." (also 23/70)

40/10: "The unbelievers will be addressed (on the day of Judgement): "Greater was the hatred of Allāh to you than (is) your hatred to yourselves, seeing that you were called to the Faith and you used to refuse."

QUR'ANIC CHALLENGES

The challenges in the following ayât prove the Divine Book's authenticity: 4/82; 2/23; 17/88; 11/13; 10/38; 39/23; 52/34; and 15/9

HISTORY OF THE QUR'ÂN IS WITHIN THE QUR'ÂN

Page | 14

The Qur'ân provides its own history. It names itself the title Qur'ân (2/185; 50/1). The Qur'ân gives the name of its author (25/5; 45/2; 46/2); the language it was revealed in (41/3; 13/37; 26/195; 16/103; 42/7; 43/3); the Book will be protected (15/9); when it was revealed (2/185); to whom it was revealed (29/48; 47/2); guarantee that the Prophet will never forget the revelation (87/6); and that it existed in written form at the time of its revelation (85/21,22; 52/2-3; 68/1). There was no lag or interval for mistakes to creep in. Every word revealed to the Prophet was immediately put to writing. The Prophet is guaranteed protection (5/67). The arrangement of the entire Qur'ân was part of the divine scheme (75/17). The Prophet under divine guidance dictated to his scribes the exact sequence of its words, verses and chapters (75/18, 19). The Book (written form) again testifies to this fact (80 / 11-16). Thus the Qur'ân has a clear background history which is not the case with any of the other Sacred Books. *(All the verses referred to in this paragraph are not quoted-but the reader is encouraged to refer to the Qur'ân to authenticate the references).*

Imam Ghazzali explains beautifully the concept of God in his book, *"The Revival of the Religious Sciences"* Vol 1-page 130:

"God has got no length and breath as these are attributes of a body which is an originated thing. Its Creator existed from before it. So how would He enter in a body, as He existed by Himself before all originated things and there was nobody along with Him? He is an All Knowing, Almighty, Willing Creator. These attributes are impossible for a body. He exists by Himself without the substances of a body. He is not like any worldly thing, rather He is ever living, everlasting, and nothing is like Him. Where is the similarity of the Creator with the created, the Fashioner with the fashioned? Hence it is impossible that anything can ever resemble Him!"

Western critics of the Qur'ân frequently point to the allegedly "incoherent" references to God - often in one and the same phrase - as "He", "God", "We" or "I", with the corresponding changes of the pronoun from "His" to "Ours" or "My", or from "Him" to "Us" or "Me". They seem to be unaware of the fact that these changes are not accidental, and not even what one might describe as "poetic licence", but are obviously deliberate, a linguistic device meant to stress the idea that God is not a "person" and cannot, therefore, be really circumscribed by the pronouns applicable to finite beings.

A FEW SCIENTIFIC FACTS UNKNOWN AT THE TIME THE QUR'ÂN WAS REVEALED IN THE 7TH CENTURY- THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 700 VERSES RELATING TO SCIENCE IN THE QUR'ÂN.

23/12-14: Man We (Allâh) did create from a quintessence (of clay); then We placed him as (a drop of) sperm in a place of rest, firmly fixed; then We made the sperm into a clot of

congealed blood; then of that clot We made a (foetus) lump; then We made out of that lump bones and clothed the bones with flesh; then We developed out of it another creature; so blessed be Allāh, the best to create!

CONTRAST THESE VERSES WITH ARISTOTLE'S FINDINGS

“As far as we know, Aristotle wrote the first embryology book in the 4th century BC. In it he recorded some observations on comparative embryology, especially on the general progress of the developing chick. **He promoted, however, the incorrect idea that the human embryo developed from a formless mass that resulted from the union of semen with menstrual blood. Scientific knowledge of embryology did not progress significantly for nearly 2000 years.**” [Africa Events, May 1985, p. 16.]

Page | 15

أَوَلَمْ يَرِ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَنَّ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ كَانَتَا رَتْقًا فَفَتَقْنَاهُمَا ۖ وَجَعَلْنَا مِنَ الْمَاءِ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ حَيٍّ أَفَلَا يُؤْمِنُونَ ﴿٢١/٣٠﴾

21/30: Do not the unbelievers see that the heavens and the earth were joined together (as one unit of creation), before We clove them asunder? We made from water every living thing. Will they not then believe? (similar message also in 75/37-39)

تَبَارَكَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ فِي السَّمَاءِ بُرُوجًا وَجَعَلَ فِيهَا سِرَاجًا وَقَمَرًا مُنِيرًا ﴿٢٥/٦١﴾

25/61: Blessed is He (Allāh) who made constellations in the skies, and placed therein a lamp and a moon (reflecting) giving light; (similar message in 10/5)

وَهُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ اللَّيْلَ وَالنَّهَارَ وَالشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ ۚ كُلٌّ فِي فَلَكٍ يَسْبَحُونَ ﴿٢١/٣٣﴾

21/33: It is He (Allāh) who created the night and the day, and the sun and the moon: all (the celestial bodies) swim along, each in its rounded course. (see also 71/15-16)

مَرَجَ الْبَحْرَيْنِ يَلْتَقِيَانِ ﴿٥٥/١٩﴾ بَيْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَا يَبْغِيَانِ ﴿٥٥/٢٠﴾

55/19-20: He (Allāh) has let free the two bodies of flowing water, meeting together: between them is a barrier which they do not transgress: (also 27/61)

CHRISTIANITY IN THE 17TH CENTURY

In the book 'Religion and the Decline of Magic' we find a well-documented account of their religious activities. We refer to the historical comment made in it, which highlights the important mental condition of the English people during the 'sixteenth- and seventeenth-century.' On the very first page of the book, it states:

“Witchcraft, astrology and every kind of popular magic flourished in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. At the same time men began to reach for a scientific explanation of the universe, and the Protestant Reformation attempted to take the magic out of religion.”

These opening remarks made in support of the author, a great historian, proving the weakness of Christianity and the effect it had on the minds of the Christians after about sixteen hundred years, could be the reason for attacking the Muslims. We must, therefore, be aware of the mind-set of these people who concocted the

history books. It could be argued that these conditions were applicable only to the poor and uneducated.

Keith Thomas, however, gives an example of some the traditions of the elite:

"The one kind of magical healing to which official indulgence was liberally extended was the cure by the royal touch. At a special religious service conducted by leading Anglican clergy the monarch laid his hands upon each member of the long queue of sufferers. **The patients approached one by one and knelt before the monarch, who lightly touched them on the face, while a chaplain read aloud the verse from St Mark: 'They shall lay hands on the sick and they recover'.** They then retired and came forward again so that the King might hang round their necks a gold coin strung from a white silk ribbon. This was the healing ritual for the King's Evil, the name given to scrofula or struma, the tubercular inflammation of the lymph glands of the neck. In practice the term was employed more loosely to comprehend a wide variety of complaints affecting the head, neck, and eyes, particularly swollen lips, tumours, sores and blisters. Scrofula itself was probably caused by infected milk, and a steady stream of deaths from the evil was recorded in the seventeenth-century London Bills Mortality."

Page | 16

THE CONQUERING OF MUSLIMS COUNTRIES:

"The generation of 1789 had seen Europe come to exercise an ultimate hegemony over the Islamic peoples. Whether a European power ruled directly or whether there was merely a generalized dependent relation to the European social order as a whole, *it was in the power of the Europeans, if they were agreed on a policy, to enforce their will in most Muslim lands. In any case, no independent general Islamic leadership was to be tolerated.*"[The Venture of Islam, Vol. 3, 1974, p. 223.]

Paul Johnson chastises the modern Western historians:

"Unfortunately, historians are rarely as objective as they wish to appear. Biblical history, which for **Christians, Jews and atheists alike involves beliefs or prejudices which go to the very root of our being, is an area where objectivity is peculiarly difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.**"

John William Draper in his significant work, "The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe" states:

"I have to deplore the systematic manner in which the literature of Europe has contrived to put out of sight our scientific obligations to the Mohammedans. Surely they can not be much longer hidden. Injustice founded on religious rancour and national conceit can not be perpetuated forever. What should the modern astronomer say when, remembering the contemporary barbarism of Europe, he finds the Arab Abdul Hassan speaking of tubes, to the extremities which ocular and objective dioptries, perhaps sights, were attached, as used at Meragha?The Arab has left his intellectual impress on Europe, as, before long, Christendom will have to confess; he has indelibly written it on the heavens, as any one may see who reads the names of the stars on a common celestial globe." . [J. W. Draper: The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe, 2nd Edition, 1864]

THE CONTRAST

Muslims are commanded in the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân to be just, even if it is against them. The guidance of the Divine Book states:

“O you who believe! Stand out firmly for Allâh, as witnesses to fair dealing, and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just; that is next to Piety; Page | 17 and fear Allâh, for Allâh is well acquainted with all that ye do.” [Al-Qur’ân 5:8]

The non-Muslims [especially Christians] never mention this command, especially when they write about the Muslims. It is clear that the non-Muslim Europeans suppressed the achievements of the early Muslims. [Refer to Draper above]. The original documents of the Europeans, which chronicled their earlier achievements, were not preserved. In fact they are untraceable. Is it not convenient to quote from lost books? To be blunt the non-Muslim European claims cannot be substantiated by the production of original works. It is claimed that the Muslim Arabs were awakened by the works of the “great” men of Greece, namely Plato and Aristotle. Today, Plato (427-347 BC?) - Aristotle (384-322 BC?) are quoted freely and yet there are no original works of them in existence. They were only acclaimed to have been great Greek “philosophers” from the 12th century CE. Their “works” seem not to have been preserved in its original form but some claim that part of it was preserved in the language of the Muslim Arabs, who made these translations from some lost originals and preserved only the translations. What is of importance to know is the following, - although it causes great problems:

“Honesty and accuracy, as we understand them, did not exist in those days. For three hundred years prior to Nicæa no historical records existed, so there was no great difficulty in deluding the people as to the past story of the cult. Anything could be added to or subtracted from its past beliefs without undue comment.” (The Unfolding Universe or The Evolution of Man’s conception of his Place in Nature, 1935, p. 144)

CLEANINESS IN ISLAM

The Muslims educated the Europeans how to wash and bathe. We substantiate this statement to allay all suspicion of bias, by referring to one of the most learned Professors of the West viz. the renowned author, John William Draper. He describes the conditions of the Europeans (when the Muslims crossed the Mediterranean, entered Spain and transformed them) as follows:

“From the barbarism of the native people of Europe, who could scarcely be said to have emerged from the savage state, unclean in person, benighted in mind, inhabiting huts in which it was a mark of wealth if there were bulrushes on the floor and straw mats against the wall; miserably fed on beans, vetches, roots, and even the bark of trees; clad in garments of untanned skin, or at the best of leather - perennial in durability, but not conducive to personal purity - a state in which the pomp of royalty was sufficiently and satisfactorily manifested in the equipage of the sovereign, an ox-cart, drawn by not less than two yokes of cattle, quickened in their movements by the goads of pedestrian serfs, whose legs were wrapped in wisps of straw ; from a people, devout believers in all the wild fictions of shrine-miracles and preposterous relics ; from the degradation of a base

theology, and from the disputes of ambitious ecclesiastics for power, it is pleasant to turn to the southwest corner of the continent, where, under auspices of a very different kind, the irradiations of light were to break forth. The crescent in the West was soon to pass eastward to its full."

The reader is reminded here that much of the literature of the early Muslims was obliterated: we refer again to

J. W. Draper's Book:

Page | 18

"As an architect may judge of the skill of the ancient Egyptians in his art from a study of the Pyramids, so from these relics of Saracenic learning we may demonstrate the intellectual state of the Mohammedan people, though much of their work has been lost and more has been purposely destroyed."

"With a pride perhaps not altogether inexcusable, the Arabians boasted of their language as being the most perfect spoken by man. Mohammed himself, when challenged to produce a miracle in proof of the authenticity of his mission, uniformly pointed to the composition of the Koran, its unapproachable excellence vindicating its inspiration. The orthodox Moslems - the Moslems are those who are submissively resigned to the Divine will - are wont to assert that every page of that book is indeed a conspicuous miracle. It is not then surprising that, in the Arabian schools, great attention was paid to the study of language, and that so many celebrated grammarians were produced. By these scholars, dictionaries, similar to those now in use, were composed; their copiousness is indicated by the circumstance that one of them consisted of sixty volumes, the definition of each word being illustrated or sustained by quotations from Arab authors of acknowledged repute. They had also ... cyclopedias such as the Historical Dictionary of Sciences of Mohammed Ibn AbdAllâh, of Granada." [History of The Intellectual Development of Europe, 1863, p. 352]

THE CHILDREN OF ISRÂ'ÎL ARE THE OFF-SPRING OF NABI YACUB, OR JACOB AS CHRISTIANS CALL HIM. JEWS ARE THE OFFSPRING OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS¹⁶.

In the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân Allâh refers to the Jews as follows: "2:113: "And النَّصَارَى (the Christians who are the people that made a man from Nazareth a god under the orders of Constantine) follow nothing (good), and النَّصَارَى say, الْيَهُودُ (the Jews- are the offspring of the Greeks and Romans) follow nothing (good), while they recite the (same) Book..." Kindly refer to the book 'The History of The Jews' by Al-Hajj Mofsowitz Potashnickh [ex Jewish Rabbi from Romania]. (Please, if you would like the book emailed free to you send an e-mail request to mofsowitz@gmail.com)

I CONCLUDE WITH TWO VERSES OF THE QUR'AN:

AL-QUR'ÂN 2:42: "AND MIX NOT UP TRUTH WITH FALSEHOOD, NOR HIDE THE TRUTH WHILE YOU KNOW."

16: Refer to: 'History of the Jews by Paul Johnson'

ALL MESSENGERS SENT WITH MESSAGES IN THE LANGUAGE OF HIS PEOPLE TO MAKE THINGS CLEAR

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانٍ قَوْمِهِ لِيُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ.....

14/4: "We (*i.e.* Allāh) sent not an apostle except (to teach) in the language of his (own) people, in order to make (things) clear to them....."

I thank you! Was salaam!-

15.02.2012.